arXiv:1511.01418v1 [math.RA] 4 Nov 2015

Ext-finite modules for weakly symmetric algebras with radical cube zero

Karin Erdmann

Dedicated to the memory of Laci Kovács.

Abstract

Assume A is weakly symmetric, indecomposable, with radical cube zero and radical square non-zero. We show that such algebra of wild representation type does not have a non-projective module M whose ext algebra is finite-dimensional. This gives a complete classification weakly symmetric indecomposable algebras which have a non-projective module whose ext algebra is finite-dimensional.

MR Subject classification: 16E40, 16G10, (16E05, 15A24, 33C45)
Keywords: extensions, finite global dimension, weakly symmetric algebras. Chebyshev polynomials.

1 Introduction

Assume A is a finite-dimensional algebra over a field K. We say that an A-module M is ext finite if there is some $n \geq 0$ such that $\mathrm{Ext}^k_A(M, M) = 0$ for $k > n$.

If $A = KG$, the group algebra of a finite group, then any ext finite module is projective (this may be found in Chapter 5 of [4]). On the other hand, there is a four-dimensional selfinjective algebra which has non-projective ext finite modules, first described in [15]. This algebra is known as q-exterior algebra, see Section 4. If a selfinjective algebra A has a non-projective ext finite module there is no support variety theory for A-modules via Hochschild cohomology. This follows from Corollary 2.3 in [10], it shows that the finite generation conditions (Fg1, 2) in [10] (and (Fg) of [16]) must fail. That is, existence of ext-finite non-projective modules gives information about action of the Hochschild cohomology on ext algebras of modules.

There is also the 'generalized Auslander-Reiten condition', GARC, which has been introduced in [1] in the context of homological conjectures, which has attracted a lot of interest, see for example [6, 7, 13, 8, 9]. The condition GARC for a ring R states:

If M is an R-module and there is some $n \geq 0$ such that $\mathrm{Ext}^k_R(M, M \oplus R) = 0$ for $k > n$, then M has projective dimension at most n.

The four-dimensional local algebra mentioned above does not satisfy GARC, there are even counterexamples with $n = 1$, see Section 4. It is not known whether there is a ring R which has a counterexample with $n = 0$.

If $R = A$ and A is a selfinjective finite-dimensional algebra then GARC states that *any ext-finite module is projective.*

The four-dimension algebras which have non-projective ext finite modules belong to the class of weakly symmetric algebras with radical cube zero. These algebras have been studied in [5, 12]. In particular it is understood when such algebra does not satisfy the (Fg) condition:

Assume A is weakly symmetric with radical cube zero (and radical square non-zero). Assume also A is indecomposable. Let E be the matrix with entries $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^1(S_i, S_j)$ where $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_r$ are the simple A-modules. Then E is a symmetric matrix, so it has real eigenvalues. The largest eigenvalue λ say, occurs with multiplicity one, and has a positive eigenvector, this is the Perron-Frobenius Theorem. It is proved in [12] that A does not satisfy (Fg) if and only if either $\lambda > 2$, or else A is Morita equivalent to a four-dimensional local algebra as above, or else to a 'Double Nakayama algebra' (see section 4), where in both cases there is a deformation parameter which is not a root of unity.

These Double Nakayama algebras also have ext-finite non-projective modules; this is probably known, we will give a proof in Section 4.

Our main result shows that a weakly symmetric algebra with radical cube zero and $\lambda > 2$ does not have ext-finite non-projective modules. With this, we get the following.

Theorem 1.1 *Assume A is a weakly symmetric indecomposable algebra over an algebraically closed field, with $J^3 = 0 \neq J^2$. Then A has an ext-finite non-projective module if and only if $\lambda = 2$ and A is Morita equivalent to either a four dimensional q-exterior algebra, or a Double Nakayama algebra, where in both cases the deformation parameter is not a root of unity.*

It follows that existence of ext finite non-projective modules is not equivalent with failure of (Fg).

The Theorem remains true for an arbitrary field if one takes for A an algebra defined by quiver and relations.

Section 2 contains the relevant background. In Section 3 we prove the main new part of the Theorem, and in Section 4 we describe ext-finite non-projective modules for the algebras for which $\lambda = 2$.

We work with finite-dimensional left A-modules, and if M, N are such A-modules then we write $\mathrm{Hom}(M, N)$ instead of $\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N)$ and similarly $\mathrm{Ext}^k(M, N)$ means $\mathrm{Ext}^k_A(M, N)$.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 We assume throughout that A is a finite-dimensional weakly symmetric algebra over an algebraically closed field K, and we assume A is indecomposable. This is no restriction since we will focus on indecomposable modules. Suppose M is a finite-dimensional A-module. Then $\mathrm{rad}(M)$ is the submodule of M such that $M/\mathrm{rad}(M)$ is the largest semisimple factor module of M, sometimes called 'top' of M. The module $\mathrm{rad}(M)$ is equal to JM where J is the radical of A. The socle of M, denoted by $\mathrm{soc}(M)$, is the largest semisimple submodule of M.

2.2 A finite-dimensional A-module M has a projective cover, that is there is a surjective map $\pi_M : P \to M$ where P is projective, and $P/\mathrm{rad}(P) \cong M/\mathrm{rad}(M)$. The kernel of π_M is unique up to isomorphism, and is denoted by $\Omega(M)$. Repeatedly taking projective covers gives a minimal projective resolution of M,

$$\ldots \to P_m \stackrel{d_m}{\to} P_{m-1} \to \ldots \stackrel{d_1}{\to} P_0 \stackrel{d_0}{\to} M \to 0$$

where $d_0 = \pi_M$ and d_m is a projective cover of $\Omega^m(M)$ for $m \geq 1$. If A is selfinjective and M is indecomposable and non-porojective then also $\Omega(M)$ is indecomposable and non-projective. In fact, Ω induces an equivalence of the stable module category of A.

2.3 We assume A is weakly symmetric. This means that A is selfinjective, and any indecomposable projective module has a simple socle, with $\mathrm{soc}(P) \cong P/\mathrm{rad}(P)$. Hence for any simple module, its projective cover is also its injective hull. This implies also that for any non-projective indecomposable A-module M we have that $M/\mathrm{rad}(M)$ is isomorphic to soc $\Omega(M)$.

Let $S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_r$ be the simple A-modules, and let P_i be the projective cover of S_i for $1 \leq i \leq r$. We assume $J^3 = 0$ but $J^2 \neq 0$. If so, then every indecomposable projective P_i must have radical length three; this is well known (and it is easy to see, recalling that we assume A to be indecomposable). So we have $P_i/\mathrm{rad}(P_i) \cong S_i \cong \mathrm{soc}(P_i)$ and $\mathrm{rad}(P_i)/\mathrm{soc}(P_i)$ is semisimple and non-zero. So we can write

$$\mathrm{rad}(P_i)/\mathrm{soc}(P_i) \cong \oplus_{j=1}^{r} S_j^{d_{ij}}$$

where $d_{ij} \geq 0$ and not all d_{ij} are zero. It is also true that for all i, j we have $d_{ij} = d_{ji}$. We will give the proof in 2.6 below.

This is sufficient information to compute dimensions of Ω-translates of M. The crucial property is the following, which is well-known. For convenience we give the proof.

Lemma 2.1 *Assume M is a module with no simple or projective summands. Then* $\mathrm{soc}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(M)$.

Proof Since M has no projective (hence injective) summand it has radical length ≤ 2. Therefore $\mathrm{rad}(M)$ is annihilated by J and hence is contained in $\mathrm{soc}(M)$. The socle of M is semisimple, hence $\mathrm{soc}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(M) \oplus C$ for some submodule C of $\mathrm{soc}(M)$. We must show that $C = 0$.

Let $\pi : M \to M/\mathrm{rad}(M)$ be the canonical surjection, then $\pi(C)$ is isomorphic to C, write $C' = \pi(C)$.

The module $M/\mathrm{rad}(M)$ is simisimple, so we can write $M/\mathrm{rad}(M) = C' \oplus G$ for some semisimple module G. Let $\tilde{G}$ be the submodule of M containing $\mathrm{rad}(M)$ such that $\tilde{G}/\mathrm{rad}(M) = G$.

Then we have that $\tilde{G} \cap C = 0$ and $M = \tilde{G} + C$: Namely if $x \in \tilde{G} \cap C$ then $x + \mathrm{rad}(M) \in G \cap C' = 0$ and therefore $x \in \mathrm{rad}(M)$, and then it is in the intersection of $\mathrm{rad}(M)$ with C and is zero. Furthermore, we have $M/\mathrm{rad}(M) = G + C'$which imples that $M = \tilde{G} + C$. So if $C \neq 0$ then it is a semisimple summand of M, and by the assumption $C = 0$. $\square$

2.4 Let M be a module such that $\mathrm{soc}(M) = \mathrm{rad}(M)$, both the socle of M and $M/\mathrm{rad}(M)$ are semisimple. We write $\underline{\dim}(\mathrm{soc}(M) = \underline{s} = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n)$ where s_i is the multiplicity of S_i in $\mathrm{soc}(M)$, and similarly we write $\underline{\dim}(M/\mathrm{rad}M) = \underline{t} = (t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n)$ where t_i is the multiplicity of S_i in $M/\mathrm{rad}\ M$.

Then we define the 'dimension vector' for M to be

$$\underline{\dim}(M) := (\underline{t} \mid \underline{s})$$

The usual dimension vector would be $\underline{t} + \underline{s}$.

Lemma 2.2 *Let X be the $2n \times 2n$ matrix which in block form is given by*

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} E & -I_n \\ I_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Assume M has no simple or projective summands, and $\Omega(M)$ is not simple. Then

$$\underline{\dim}\Omega(M)^T = X\underline{\dim}(M)^T.$$

Proof Consider the projective cover of M,

$$0 \to \Omega(M) \to P_M \to M \to 0$$

Then $P_M \cong \oplus_{i=1}^n t_i P_i$ since $P_M/\mathrm{rad}(P_M)$ must be isomorphic to $M/\mathrm{rad}(M)$. Since M has no projective (hence injective) summands, the socle of $\Omega(M)$ is isomorphic to $\mathrm{soc}(P_M)$ that is $\oplus t_i S_i$.

As well, since $\Omega(M)$ has no simple or projective summand, we know $\mathrm{soc}\ \Omega(M) = \mathrm{rad}\ \Omega(M)$,

Factoring out the socle of $\Omega(M)$ we get a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \Omega(M)/\mathrm{soc}\Omega(M) \to P_M/\mathrm{soc}(P_M) \to M \to 0$$

If we restrict this to the radical of $P_M/\mathrm{soc}(P_M)$ then we get a split exact sequence,

$$0 \to \Omega(M)/\mathrm{soc}\Omega(M) \to \mathrm{rad}(P_M)/\mathrm{soc}(P_M) \to \mathrm{soc}(M) \to 0$$

Hence the dimension vector of $\Omega(M)/\mathrm{soc}\Omega(M)$ is equal to

$$E\underline{t}^T - \underline{s}^T$$

as required. $\square$

This would still be true if $\Omega(M)$ is simple. Since we want to iterate the calculation, we exclude this.

2.5 If none of the the modules $\Omega^r(M)$ for $r = 1, 2, \ldots, k+1$ is simple, it follows that the dimension vector of $\Omega^k(M)$ is equal to $X^k \underline{\dim}(M)^T$. The matrix X^k is of the form

$$X^k = \begin{pmatrix} f_k(E) & -f_{k-1}(E) \\ f_{k-1}(E) & -f_{k-2}(E) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here $f_m(x)$ is the m-th Chebyshev polynomial, given by

$$f_0(x) = 1, \quad f_1(x) = x, \quad f_k(x) = xf_{k-1}(x) - f_{k-2}(x) \ (k \geq 2).$$

The polynomial $f_k(x)$ is the characteristic polynomial of the $k \times k$ incidence matrix of the Dynkin diagram of type A_k, that is it has entries $a_{i,i\pm1} = 1$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.

As well, $f_k(x) = U_k(x/2)$ where $U_k(x)$ is a version of a Chebyshev polynomial of the second kind. These polynomials are studied extensively in numerical mathematics, see for example [14].

2.6 We recall that if S is a simple module then for any $k \geq 1$ and for any module M we have

$$\mathrm{Ext}^k(M, S) = \mathrm{Hom}(\Omega^k(M), S)$$

We give the argument. Take the exact sequence

$$0 \to \Omega^k(M) \to P_{k-1} \to \Omega^{k-1}(M) \to 0$$

and apply $\mathrm{Hom}(-, S)$. If $\pi : P_{k-1} \to S$ then clearly this restricts to the zero map $\Omega^k(M) \to S$. Hence the inclusion $\mathrm{Hom}(\Omega^{k-1}(M), S) \to \mathrm{Hom}(P_{k-1}, S)$ is an isomorphism. Therefore $\mathrm{Hom}(\Omega^k(M), S) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Omega^{k-1}(M), S)$ which is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Ext}^k(M, S)$.

We claim that $d_{ij} = d_{ji}$, which shows that the matrix E is symmetric: We may assume $i \neq j$. Then since P_j is the projective cover of S_j we have

$$d_{ij} = \dim \mathrm{Hom}(P_j, P_i)$$

But P_i is also the injective hull of S_i, so the dimension is also equal to the number of times S_i occurs in P_j, which is equal to d_{ji}.

3 The main result

Assume that A is weakly symmetric with $J^3 = 0 \neq J^2$ and A has an ext finite non-projective module, then there is such M which is indecomposable. We will analyse the dimension vectors of the modules $\Omega^r(M)$ for large r.

We may assume that $\Omega^r(M)$ is not simple for $r \geq 0$: Namely at most finitely many of the $\Omega^k(M)$ can be simple, since otherwise it would follow that M is periodic, but then M would not be ext finite. So there is some m such that for $k \geq m$ none of the modules $\Omega^k(M)$ is simple. We replace M by $\Omega^m(M)$. With M, also $\Omega^m(M)$ is ext-finite and not projective, recall that Ω induces an equivalence of the stable category.

Lemma 3.1 *Assume* $\mathrm{Ext}^k(M,M) = 0$ *for* $k > n$. *Let* $(\underline{t} \mid \underline{s})$ *be the dimension vector of* M *and* $(\underline{t}^{(k+1)} \mid \underline{s}^{(k+1)})$ *be the dimension vector of* $\Omega^{k+1}(M)$. *Then for all* $k > n$ *we have*

$$(\underline{s} \mid -\underline{t}) \cdot (\underline{t}^{(k+1)} \mid \underline{s}^{(k+1)}) = 0.$$

Proof By the assumption, and by 2.1, $\mathrm{soc}(M) = JM$, so we have a short exact sequence

$$(*) \qquad 0 \to M_2 = \mathrm{soc}(M) \to M \to M_1 = M/JM \to 0$$

where M_1 and M_2 are semisimple. Write $M_1 = \oplus_i t_i S_i$ and $M_2 = \oplus_i s_i S_i$. Then $\dim(M) = (\underline{t} \mid \underline{s})$.

We apply the functor $\mathrm{Hom}(M, -)$ to (*) which gives the long exact sequence of homology. Part of this is

$$\ldots \to \mathrm{Ext}^k(M,M) \to \mathrm{Ext}^k(M,M_1) \to \mathrm{Ext}^{k+1}(M,M_2) \to \mathrm{Ext}^{k+1}(M,M) \to \ldots.$$

Consider $\mathrm{Ext}^k(M,M_1)$, this is isomorphic to $\oplus_i t_i \mathrm{Ext}^k(M,S_i)$, and $\mathrm{Ext}^k(M,S_i) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\Omega^k(M), S_i)$ (see 2.6). This has dimension

$$\sum_i t_i t_i^{(k)}.$$

Similarly $\mathrm{Ext}^{k+1}(M,M_2)$ has dimension

$$\sum_i s_i t_i^{(k+1)}.$$

By exactness we get for $k > n$ that $\mathrm{Ext}^k(M, M_1) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^{k+1}(M, M_2)$. Equating dimensions, we have

$$\sum_i t_i t_i^{(k)} = \sum_i s_i t_i^{(k+1)}.$$

By 2.3 we know that $\underline{t}^{(k)} = \underline{s}^{(k+1)}$. Using this, and rewriting the last identity we get the claim. $\square$

3.2 We analyse $(\underline{s} \mid -\underline{t}) \cdot (\underline{t}^{(k+1)} \mid \underline{s}^{(k+1)})$, which is equal to

$$(\underline{s} \mid -\underline{t}) X^{k+1} (\underline{t} \mid \underline{s})^T \tag{1k}$$

for $k > n$. We substitute X^{k+1} and expand, then (1k) becomes

$$\underline{s} f_{k+1}(E) \underline{t}^T - \underline{t} f_k(E) \underline{t}^T - \underline{s} f_k(E) \underline{s}^T + \underline{t} f_{k-1}(E) \underline{s}^T \tag{2k}.$$

The matrix $f_{k-1}(E)$ is symmetric, so we can intechange $\underline{t}$ and $\underline{s}$ in the last term. Then using the recurrence relation for the Chebyshev polynomials,

$$f_{k+1}(x) = x f_k(x) - f_{k-1}(x),$$

the expression (2k) becomes

$$\underline{s} E f_k(E) \underline{t}^T - \underline{t} f_k(E) \underline{t}^T - \underline{s} f_k(E) \underline{s}^T. \tag{3k}$$

Since E is real symmetric, there is an orthogonal matrix R such that $R^T E R = D$, a diagonal matrix. We substitute $E = RDR^T$, and we set $\underline{\alpha} := \underline{s}R$ and $\underline{\beta} := \underline{t}R$. With this, noting also that $R f_k(E) R^T = f_k(RER^T)$, expression (3k) becomes

$$\underline{\alpha} D f_k(D) \underline{\beta}^T - \underline{\beta} f_k(D) \underline{\beta}^T - \underline{\alpha} f_k(D) \underline{\alpha}^T. \tag{4k}$$

The matrices involved are diagonal, let $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r$ be the eigenvalues of D. Then (4k) is equal to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} (\alpha_i \beta_i \lambda_i - \beta_i^2 - \alpha_i^2) f_k(\lambda_i).$$

If we denote the distinct eigenvalues of D by $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m$ then this becomes

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m} \Big(\sum_{\lambda_i = \mu_j} \alpha_i \beta_i \lambda_i - \beta_i^2 - \alpha_i^2 \Big) f_k(\mu_j). \tag{5k}$$

Then Lemma 3.1 shows that (5k) is zero for all $k > n$. The coefficients $c_j := (\sum_{\lambda_i=\mu_j} \alpha_i\beta_i\lambda_i - \beta_i^2 - \alpha_i^2)$ do not depend on k. We take any m of these equations for $k > n$ and write them in matrix form. That is, consider a matrix

$$C := \begin{pmatrix} f_N(\mu_1) & f_N(\mu_2) & \dots & f_N(\mu_m) \\ f_{N+i_1}(\mu_1) & f_{N+i_1}(\mu_2) & \dots & f_{N+i_1}(\mu_m) \\ \dots & & & \\ f_{N+i_{m-1}}(\mu_1) & f_{N+i_{m-1}}(\mu_2) & \dots & f_{N+i_{m-1}}(\mu_m) \end{pmatrix}$$

with $N > n$ and $0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_{m-1}$. Then for any such C we have

$$C \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \\ \vdots \\ c_m \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

Lemma 3.2 *There are $N > n$ and $0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_m$ such that C is non-singular.*

Proof We use induction on m. Assume first $m = 1$. We have $f_0(\lambda_1) = 1 \neq 0$. Whenever $f_{u-1}(\lambda_1) \neq 0$ and $f_u(\lambda_1) = 0$ then $f_{u+1}(\lambda_1) = -f_{u-1}(\lambda_1) \neq 0$. So at worst every second of the values can be zero.

Now we fix some $N > n$ such that $f_N(\lambda_1) \neq 0$. Consider the matrix with rows

$$R_{N+j} := (f_{N+j}(\mu_1), f_{N+j}(\mu_2), \ldots, f_{N+j}(\mu_m))$$

for $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k$ and k large, $k > m + 2$. We replace R_{N+k} by $R_{N+k} + R_{N+k-2} - \mu_1 R_{N+k-1}$ and obtain as the new last row

$$[0, (\mu_2 - \mu_1)f_{N+k-2}(\mu_2), \ldots, (\mu_m - \mu_1)f_{N+k-2}(\mu_m)]$$

Similarly we replace R_{N+k-1}, and so on. This process ends when row R_{N+2} has become

$$[0, (\mu_2 - \mu_1)f_{N+1}(\mu_2), \ldots, (\mu_m - \mu_1)f_{N+1}(\mu_m)]$$

By construction, $f_N(\mu_1) \neq 0$, and we take the row of $f_N(\mu_i)$ as the first row of our required submatrix.

We apply the inductive hypothesis to the matrix consisting of $R_{N+2}, \ldots, R_{N+k}$ omitting the first column. Note that from each column we can take a non-zero scalar factor $\mu_i - \mu_1$. The remaining matrix has the same shape again with $m-1$ columns. So by the inductive hypothesis it has $m-1$ rows which form a non-singular submatrix. □

Example 3.3 The roots of $f_r(x)$ are precisely the eigenvalues of the $r \times r$ matrix E with $e_{i,i\pm1} = 1$ and $e_{ij} = 0$ otherwise (see 2.5). By the Cayley-Hamilton theorem we know that $f_r(E) = 0$. In [11] it is proved that the sequence of matrices $(f_m(E))$ is periodic. In fact one can see from the proof there that there are r successive rows which are linearly independent, but there are rows of zeros.

For example $r = 2$, then the eigenvalues are ±1 and the rows are

$$\begin{matrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \\ -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \\ \cdots \end{matrix}.$$

Corollary 3.4 *If (1k) is zero for all $k > n$ then for all j with $1 \leq j \leq m$ we have*

$$\sum_{\lambda_i = \mu_j} (\alpha_i \beta_i \lambda_i - \beta_i^2 - \alpha_i^2) = 0.$$

This follows from the previous Lemma.

Let $\lambda_1 = \lambda$, the largest eigenvalue of E. We assume A is indecomposable and therefore E is an irreducible matrix. Therefore λ has multiplicity one as an eigenvalue of E, and there is a real eigenvector $\underline{v}$ with $v_i > 0$ for all i. We may take it as a unit vector, and then $\underline{v}^T$ is the first column of R where $R^T E R = D$. Recall $\underline{\alpha} = \underline{s}R$ and $\underline{\beta} = \underline{t}R$. These have first components

$$\alpha_1 = \sum_i s_i v_i, \quad \beta_1 = \sum_i t_i v_i.$$

Since $\underline{s}$ and $\underline{t}$ are non-zero in $\mathbb{Z}^r_{\geq 0}$ it follows that α_1 and β_1 are positive. Because λ has multiplicity one, the sum in 3.4 for λ has only one term, and we deduce:

Corollary 3.5 *The numbers α_1/β_1 and β_1/α_1 are roots of the equation*

$$X^2 - \lambda X + 1$$

We may do the same calculation with $\Omega^m(M)$ instead of M for any $m \geq -1$, denote the corresponding numbers by $\beta_1^{(m)}$ and $\alpha_1^{(m)}$. For any such m, the two quotients must therefore be roots of the above quadratic equation, that is

$$(**) \qquad \frac{\beta_1^{(m)}}{\alpha_1^{(m)}} + \frac{\alpha_1^{(m)}}{\beta_1^{(m)}} = \lambda$$

We can say more.

Lemma 3.6 *We have* $\beta_1^{(m+1)} = \lambda\beta_1^{(m)} - \alpha_1^{(m)}$.

Proof For the proof, it suffices to take $m = 0$. We have $\underline{t}^{(1)} = E\underline{t}^T - \underline{s}$ and therefore

$$\underline{t}_i^{(1)} = (E\underline{t}^T)_i - s_i$$

Now $(E\underline{t}^T)_i = \sum_{k=1}^r e_{ik}t_k = \sum_{k=1}^r e_{ki}t_k$ (recall E is symmetric). Then

$$\beta_1^{(1)} + \alpha_1^{(0)} = \sum_{i=1}^n (E\underline{t}^T)_i v_i.$$

We substitute and change the order of summation and get that this equal to

$$\sum_{k=1}^r (\sum_{i=1}^r e_{ki}v_i)t_k.$$

The coefficient of t_k is the k-th entry of $E\underline{v}^T = \lambda\underline{v}$, which is λv_k. So we get

$$\beta_1^{(1)} + \alpha_1^{(1)} = \lambda \sum_k v_k t_k = \lambda\beta_1^{(0)},$$

as stated. □

Proposition 3.7 *If M is ext-finite then $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$. In particular $\lambda = 2$.*

Proof (1) First we claim that $\alpha_1^{(m)}/\beta_1^{(m)} = \alpha_1^{(m+1)}/\beta_1^{(m+1)}$.
By Lemma 3.6, and since $\alpha_1^{(m+1)} = \beta_1^{(m)}$ (recall $\underline{s}^{(m+1)} = \underline{t}^{(m)}$), we have

$$\frac{\beta_1^{(m+1)}}{\alpha_1^{(m+1)}} = \lambda - \frac{\alpha_1^{(m)}}{\beta_1^{(m)}}$$

Using also (**) we deduce

$$\frac{\beta_1^{(m+1)}}{\alpha_1^{(m+1)}} + \frac{\alpha_1^{(m+1)}}{\beta_1^{(m+1)}} = \lambda = \lambda + \frac{\alpha_1^{(m+1)}}{\beta_1^{(m+1)}} - \frac{\alpha_1^{(m)}}{\beta_1^{(m)}}$$

and hence the claim follows.

The set of positive numbers $\{\alpha_1^{(m)}, m \geq -1\}$ is bounded below, and it is a discrete subset of $\mathbb{R}$, therefore it has a minimum. That is, we may choose M in its Ω-orbit so that the number $\alpha_1^{(1)} \leq \alpha_1^{(m)}$ for all $m \geq -1$.
Then $\beta_1^{(1)} = \alpha_1^{(2)} \geq \alpha_1^{(1)} = \beta_1^{(0)}$ and $\alpha_1^{(1)} \leq \alpha_1^{(0)}$. It follows that

$$\frac{\alpha_1^{(0)}}{\beta_1^{(0)}} = \frac{\alpha_1^{(0)}}{\alpha_1^{(1)}} \geq 1$$
$$\frac{\alpha_1^{(1)}}{\beta_1^{(1)}} = \frac{\alpha_1^{(1)}}{\alpha_1^{(2)}} \leq 1$$

and hence the fractions must be equal to 1.

So the quadratic equation has one root equal to 1. The product of the roots is 1, so both roots are equal to 1 and then $\lambda = 2$. $\square$

We have proved that for $\lambda \neq 2$, the algebra has no ext-finite modules.

Remark 3.8 Assume $\lambda = 2$. For the algebras without (Fg), (which are of type $\tilde{A}$, or local,) the vector $\underline{v}$ is a multiple of $(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$, and if $\alpha_1^{(m)} = \beta_1^{(m)}$ for all m then the socle and the top of any Ω-translate of M have the same dimension. So M has even dimension, and it follows that M cannot be an Ω translate of a simple module. Namely the Ω translates of simple modules have odd dimensions for these algebras.

4 Algebras where $\lambda = 2$

If A has an ext-finite non-projective module then (Fg) does not hold. By [12] when $\lambda = 2$, the algebra is Morita equivalent to either the q-exterior algebra, or to an algebra of type $\widetilde{A}_n$, which we call a Double Nakayama algebra. In both cases, there is a deformation parameter which is not a root of 1 (and non-zero).

4.1 The q-exterior algebra

Let $\Lambda = \Lambda(q) = K\langle x, y\rangle/(x^2, y^2, xy + qyx)$ and $0 \neq q \in K$. We assume that q is not a root of unity.

It was discovered by R. Schulz, already some years ago, that this algebra has ext finite non-projective modules, see section 4 in [15].

For $0 \neq \lambda \in K$ we define a Λ-module $M = C(\lambda)$ as follows. It is 2-dimensional and x, y act by

$$x \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad y \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

It is clearly indecomposable and not projective, and it is easy to check that $C(\lambda) \cong C(\mu)$ only if $\lambda = \mu$. We construct $C(\lambda)$ as the submodule of Λ generated by $\zeta = -\lambda qx + y \in \Lambda$, and take basis $\zeta, x\zeta$.

Lemma 4.1 *We have* $\Omega^m(C(\lambda)) \cong C(q^{-m}\lambda)$ *for* $m \geq 0$.

Proof We find $\Omega(M) = \{z \in \Lambda : z\zeta = 0\} = \Lambda(y - \lambda x)$ and if $\zeta_1 = y - \lambda x$ then $y\zeta_1 = \lambda q^{-1} x\zeta_1$. That is, $\Omega(M) \cong C(\lambda q^{-1})$, and the statement follows.

For convenience we give a proof showing that the module $C(\lambda)$ is ext-finite.

Lemma 4.2 *If* $\mu \in K$ *and* $\mu \neq \lambda$ *or* $q\lambda$ *then* $\mathrm{Ext}^1_(C(\mu), C(\lambda)) = 0$.

Proof A projective cover of $C(\mu)$ is of the form

$$0 \to C(\mu q^{-1}) \to \Lambda \to C(\mu) \to 0$$

Applying $\mathrm{Hom}(-, C(\lambda))$ gives a four term exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathrm{Hom}(C(\mu), C(\lambda)) \to \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, C(\lambda)) \to \mathrm{Hom}(C(\mu q^{-1}, C(\lambda))$$
$$\to \mathrm{Ext}^1(C(\mu), C(\lambda)) \to 0$$

With the assumptions, the first and the third term are 1-dimensional. As well $\mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, C(\lambda)$ is 2-dimensional, and hence the ext space is zero.

Corollary 4.3 *Let* $M = C(\lambda)$, *then* $\mathrm{Ext}^k(M, M) = 0$ *for* $k \geq 2$. *Hence* M *is ext finite and not projective.*

Proof We have $\mathrm{Ext}^k(M, M) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^1(\Omega^{k-1}(M), M) = \mathrm{Ext}^1(C(q^{-k+1}\lambda), C(\lambda)) = 0$.

4.2 Double Nakayama algebras

We consider algebras of the form $A = A(t) = K\mathcal{Q}/I$ where $K\mathcal{Q}$ is the path algebra of a quiver of the form



We label the vertices by $\mathbb{Z}_r$ and the arrows are $a_i : i \mapsto i+1$ and $b_i : i+1 \mapsto i$. The ideal I is generated by $a_{i+1}a_i, \quad b_ib_{i+1}$ and

$$b_ia_i + a_{i-1}b_{i-1}(i \neq 0), \quad b_0a_0 + ta_{r-1}b_{r-1}$$

where $0 \neq t \in K$. We call this algebra, and any Morita equivalent version, a Double Nakayama algebra.

We want to show that if t is not a root of unity then A has non-projective ext finite modules.

Note that for an arrow $a_i : i \to i+1$ we have in the algebra that $a_i = e_{i+1}a_ie_i$ where e_i is the idempotent corresponding to vertex i.

Lemma 4.4 *The algebra A has a subalgebra Λ isomorphic to $\Lambda(q)$ where $q^r - t^{-1} = 0$, and A is projective as a left and right Λ-module.*

Proof Let $x ::= q^ra_0 + q^{r-1}a_1 + q^{r-2}a_2 + \ldots + qa_{r-1}$ and $y := b_0 + b_1 + b_2 + \ldots + b_{r-1}$. One checks that $xy + qyx = 0$ but $xy \neq 0$; and clearly $x^2 = 0$ and $y^2 = 0$. Take B to be the subalgebra with generators x, y.

Consider A as a left Λ-module, one checks that $A = \oplus_{i=0}^{r-1}\Lambda e_i$ and that $A = \oplus_{i=0}^{r-1}e_i\Lambda$.

Remark 4.5 (1) By the previous Lemma, the functor $A \otimes_\Lambda (-)$ is exact and takes projective modules to projective modules. In the following we write $A \otimes (-)$ for $A \otimes_\Lambda (-)$. As well, for any Λ-module N the module $A \otimes N$ has dimension $r \cdot \dim N$.

(2) We have $xe_i = qa_i = e_{i+1}x$ and $ye_i = b_{i-1} = e_{i-1}y$. Hence

$$e_i(yx) = (yx)e_i = qb_ia_i$$

(3) If the Λ-module N has no non-zero projective summands then $A \otimes N$ has no non-zero projective summands: More generally, a module of a selfinjective algebra has no non-zero projective summands if and only if it is annihilated by the socle of the algebra.

Here, the socle of A is spanned by the elements b_ia_i, and for $w \in N$ we have

$$q(b_ia_i) \otimes w = e_i(yx) \otimes w = e_i \otimes yxw = 0$$

since yx is in the socle of Λ.

Now let $M = C(\lambda)$, the Λ-module as in Subsection 4.1.

(4) By (1) and (3) we have that

$$\Omega(A \otimes M) \cong A \otimes \Omega(M) = A \otimes C(q^{-1}\lambda).$$

Lemma 4.6 *If $r > 0$ then $\mathrm{Hom}_A(A \otimes C(q^{-r}\lambda), A \otimes M)$ has dimension r.*

Proof By adjointness

$$(*) \qquad \mathrm{Hom}_A(A \otimes C(q^{-r}\lambda), A \otimes M) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(C(q^{-r}\lambda), A \otimes M)$$

where $A \otimes M$ is restricted to Λ, and we work with the Λ-homomorphisms. One checks that the Λ-socle of $A \otimes M$ is equal to $A \otimes \mathrm{soc}M = \mathrm{rad}_\Lambda(A \otimes M)$ and hence this has dimension r.

The space (*) contains all maps with image in the Λ-socle of $A \otimes M$ and this has dimension r. So we must show that for $r \neq 0$ there are no other homomorphisms, that is, we have no monomorphism from $C(q^{-r}\lambda)$ to $A \otimes M$ for $r \neq 0$.

Assume there is a monomorphism, then the image is a cyclic Λ-submodule of $A \otimes M$ of dimension two. So let ξ be a generator for a cyclic two-dimensional submodule of $A \otimes M$. We may assume that ξ is of the form

$$\xi = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_r} c_i(e_i \otimes \zeta)$$

[if $w \in \mathrm{soc}(A)$ then $w \otimes \xi = 0$. Furthermore if $w \in \mathrm{rad}(A)$ and $w \otimes \xi$ is in the socle of $A \otimes M$, then it may be omitted from a cyclic generator.]

We require that $x\xi$ and $y\xi$ are linearly dependent. By the identities in Remark 4.5,

$$x\xi = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_r} c_{j-1}(e_j \otimes x\zeta), \quad y\xi = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_r} c_{j+1}(e_j \otimes y\zeta) = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}_r} \lambda c_{j+1}(e_j \otimes x\zeta).$$

Assume $y\xi = \mu x\xi$ for some scalar $\mu \neq 0$. The set $\{e_i \otimes x\zeta\}$ is linearly independent, so we must have

$$c_{j-1}\mu = \lambda c_{j-1} \ (j \in \mathbb{Z}_r)$$

So we get if r is even, $c_j = (\mu^{-1}\lambda)^{r/2}c_j$ for all j and if r is odd, $c_j = (\mu^{-1}\lambda)^{r-1}c_j$ for all j.

Hence if there is such element ξ then $\mu = \lambda \cdot \omega$ for some root of unity ω.

If $\mu = q^{-r}\lambda$ then $\mu = \lambda \cdot \omega$ only if $r = 0$, and our claim is proved. □

Proposition 4.7 *Let $M = C(\lambda)$. Then $A \otimes M$ is ext-finite and not projective.*

Proof We have seen in the remark that $A \otimes M$ is not projective, and we have seen $\Omega^r(A \otimes M) \cong A \otimes C(q^{-r}\lambda)$. Take the exact sequence

$$0 \to A \otimes C(q^{-r-1}\lambda) \to A \otimes \Lambda \to A \otimes C(q^{-r}\lambda) \to 0$$

and apply the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_A(-, A \otimes M)$. Then by using adjointness we get the four-term exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(C(q^{-r}\lambda), A\otimes M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(\Lambda, A\otimes M) \to \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(C(q^{-r-1}\lambda), A\otimes M$$

$$\to \mathrm{Ext}^1_\Lambda(C(q^{-r}), A \otimes M) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^r_A(\Omega^r(A \otimes M), A \otimes M) \to 0$$

If $r > 0$ then the first and the third term of the sequence has dimension r. As well, the second term has dimension $2r$ and hence the fourth term is zero. Hence for all $r > 0$ we have $\mathrm{Ext}^1_A(\Omega^r(A \otimes M), A \otimes M) = 0$. This is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Ext}^{r+1}_A(A \otimes M, A \otimes M)$ and hence $A \otimes M$ is ext-finite.

□

References

[1] M. Auslander, I. Reiten, *On a generalized version of the Nakayama conjecture.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **52**(1975), 69-74.

[2] M. Auslander, I. Reiten, S. Smalø, Representation theory of Artin algebras, CUP Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics **36**, 1995.

[3] I. Assem, D. Simson and A. Skowroński, *Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras.* Vol 1, Techniques of representation theory. London Mathematical Society Student Texts, **65**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[4] D. J. Benson, *Representations and cohomology. II. Cohomology of groups and modules.* Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics,**31**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

[5] D. J. Benson, Resolutions over symmetric algebras with radical cube zero. J. Algebra **320** (2008), no. 1, 48-???56.

[6] L.W. Christensen, H. Holm, *Algebras that satisfy Auslander's condition on vanishing of cohomology*, Math. Z. **265** (2010), 21- 40.

[7] O. Celikbas, R. Takahashi, *Auslander-Reiten conjecture and Auslander-Reiten duality,* arXiv:1112.6201v3

[8] K. Diveris, M. Purin, *Vanishing of self-extensions over symmetric algebras.* J. Pure Appl. Algebra **218** (2014), no. 5, 962 - 971.

[9] K. Diveris, M. Purin, *The generalized Auslander-Reiten condition for the bounded derived category.* Arch. Math. **98** (2012), no. 6, 507 - 511.

[10] K. Erdmann, M. Holloway, N. Snashall, O. Solberg and R. Taillefer, *Support varieties for selfinjective algebras.* K-Theory **33** (2004), no. 1, 67 - 87.

[11] K. Erdmann, S. Schroll, Chebyshev polynomials on symmetric matrices. Linear Algebra Appl. **434** (2011), no. 12, 2475 - 2496.

[12] K. Erdmann, Ø. Solberg, *Radical cube zero weakly symmetric algebras and support varieties.* J. Pure Appl. Algebra **215** (2011), no. 2, 185-200.

[13] D. A. Jorgensen, *Finite projective dimension and the vanishing of* $\mathrm{Ext}_R(M, M)$. Comm. Algebra **36** (2008) No. 12, 4461-4471.

[14] T. J. Rivlin, *Chebyshev polynomials. From approximation theory to algebra and number theory.* Second edition. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1990.

[15] R. Schulz, *Boundedness and periodicity of modules over QF rings,* J. Algebra **101** (1986), 450–469.

[16] Ø. Solberg, *Support varieties for modules and complexes.* Trends in representation theory of algebras and related topics, 239 - 270, Contemp. Math., **406**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.

Karin Erdmann, Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, ROQ, Oxford OX2 6GG, UK

email: erdmann@maths.ox.ac.uk